

### REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated February 9, 2005, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendment and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-26 were pending in this application. Independent claims are 1, 6, 14, 20, 24 and 25. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify the claimed invention and to include additional limitations previously recited in claims 2-3. Claims 2-3 have been amended to include similar limitations recited in claim 6. Claim 5 has been amended to correct matter of form. Accordingly, claims 1-26 will be pending herein upon entry of this Amendment. No new matter has been added. For the reasons stated below, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims pending in this application are in condition for allowance.

In the Office Action mailed, claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for insufficient antecedent basis. This rejection is believed to have been overcome by the amended claims 1 and 5.

Claims 1-2 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Templeman, U.S. Patent No. 5,845,303 (hereinafter Templeman) in view of Ferrel et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,199,082 (hereinafter Ferrel). Claims 3 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Templeman and Ferrel, and further in view of Philyaw et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,829,646 (hereinafter Philyaw). Claims 6-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Templeman, and Ferrel, and further in view of Philyaw. To

the extent any of these rejections might still be applied to claims presently pending in this application, it is respectfully traversed.

In amended claim 1, Applicants clarify that the scheduling step for the delivery of nodes is “based on the plurality of resolution levels.” In other words, delivery of the nodes depends on resolution levels associated with the nodes. In an exemplary embodiment of the present invention, e.g., as recited in claims 2-3, scheduling relates to delivering a node initially at a first resolution level, and then delivering the same node a second time, but at a finer resolution level. This limitation is not taught or suggested in any of the cited references. In Ferrel, column 11, lines 30-44, the scheduling taught there is believed to be related to document delivery time, and has nothing to do with resolution levels of nodes. Thus, even if one of ordinary skill in the art were to modify the Templeman invention to include the scheduling scheme suggested by Ferrel, the modification would not arrive at what is claimed in claim 1 of the present application, which relates to scheduling delivery of nodes based on resolution levels of the nodes. Accordingly, Applicants believe that the rejections associated with claims 1-5 have been overcome.

Regarding claim 6, Applicants do not believe any of the cited references, alone or in combination, teaches “delivering an initial batch of nodes to the second computer, wherein the initial batch comprises nodes in a coarse resolution of the plurality of resolution levels; and supplementing the second computer with a subsequent batch of nodes, wherein the subsequent batch comprises nodes in a finer resolution of the plurality of resolution levels.” As stated above, delivery of nodes as claimed in the present application is based on resolution levels of the nodes. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection. At

least due to their dependencies from claim 6, Applicants believe claims 7-13 are also in condition for allowance.

Based on the clarification provided above, Applicants respectfully note that each of the remaining independent claims 14, 20, 24 and 25 recites limitations that are not taught or suggested in any of the cited references. For example, Applicants believe at least the following limitations associated with these claims are present in any of the cited references:

Claim 14: wherein when the request is received from the second computer, the first computer retrieves the document from the memory, decomposes the document into a plurality of nodes in accordance with a document model associated with the document, associates the plurality of nodes with one or more regions of a virtual layout space, creates a plurality of resolution levels for one or more of the plurality of nodes, renders to the second computer a first number of the plurality of nodes represented in a coarse resolution suitable for the client, supplements the second computer with a second number of the plurality of nodes represented in a finer resolution based on a data anticipation analysis;

Claim 20: the first computer decomposing the document into a plurality of nodes in accordance with a document model associated with the document;

the first computer associating each of the plurality of nodes with at least one region of a virtual layout space that conforms with the screen size of the second computer;

the first computer creating a plurality of resolution levels for one or more of the plurality of nodes based at least in part on the screen size of the second computer;

the first computer rendering to the second computer an initial batch of nodes;

the second computer monitoring how the initial batch of nodes is manipulated by a user of the second computer;

the second computer formulating a second request based at least in part on a result of the monitoring step;

the second computer sending the second request to the first computer; and

the first computer supplementing a subsequent batch of nodes to the second computer in accordance with the second request.

Claim 24: creating a plurality of resolution levels for one or more of the plurality of nodes, wherein the plurality of resolution levels comprises at least a coarse resolution, a medium resolution, and a fine resolution;

preparing a skeleton document comprising one or more of the plurality of nodes represented in the coarse resolution;

rendering the skeleton document to the second computer;

anticipating which region of the virtual layout space that the second computer is likely to view next based at least in part on how the skeleton document is manipulated by a user of the second computer;

delivering nodes represented in the medium resolution based on a result of the anticipating step; and

delivering nodes represented in the fine resolution if the user specifically selects a region associated with the nodes.

Claim 25: associating each of the plurality of nodes with at least one region of the virtual layout space by the first computer;

preparing a baseline document by the first computer, wherein the baseline comprising one or more of the plurality of nodes;

rendering the baseline document by the first computer to the second computer;

caching the baseline documents by the first and second computers;

receiving a subsequent request for the document by the first computer from the second computer;

obtaining a second version of the document by the first computer;  
comparing nodes of the second version to the nodes of the baseline document by the first computer; and  
rendering differences between nodes of the second version and nodes of the baseline document, if any, by the first computer to the second computer.

Accordingly, Applicants believe that all rejections have been overcome by the foregoing amendments and remarks.

In view of the foregoing all of the claims in this case are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions or determine that any further action is desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP  
1650 Tysons Boulevard  
McLean, VA 22102  
Tel: 703-770-7696

Date: August 9, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

KO et al.

By:



Poh C. Chua  
Registration No. 44,615